

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22

BEFORE THE

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF: )  
 )  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION )  
On Its Own Motion )  
-vs- ) No. 03-0700  
INTERSTATE POWER AND LIGHT )  
COMPANY )  
 )  
Reconciliation of revenues )  
collected under gas adjustment )  
charges with actual costs )  
prudently incurred )

Chicago, Illinois

November 17, 2004

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at

11 o'clock a.m.

BEFORE :

MS. LESLIE HAYNES,  
Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES :

MR. MARK MAPLE and  
MS. BURMA C. JONES (via telephone)  
527 East Capitol Avenue  
Springfield, Illinois 62701  
appearing for Staff of the Illinois  
Commerce Commission;

1 APPEARANCES (Cont'd.):

2 MS. JENNIFER MOORE (via telephone)  
200 First Street, S.E.,  
3 Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 52401  
appearing for Interstate Power and  
4 Light Company.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by  
21 PATRICIA WESLEY  
LICENSE NO. 084-002170

22

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

I N D E X

<u>Witnesses:</u>	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Cross</u>	<u>Re-</u> <u>direct</u>	<u>Re-</u> <u>cross</u>	<u>By</u> <u>Examiner</u>
MICHAEL BREMEL	11				
BURMA C. JONES	16				
MARK MAPLE	17				

E X H I B I T S

Interstate	For Identification	In Evidence
Nos. 1.0	15	15
1.1	15	15
1.2	15	15
1.3	15	15
2.0	15	15
2.1	15	15
2.2	15	15
Staff	<u>For Identification</u>	<u>In Evidence</u>
No. 1.0	17	17
2.0	18	18

1 JUDGE HAYNES: Pursuant to the direction of the  
2 Illinois Commerce Commission, I now call Docket No.  
3 03-0700. This is the ICC on its own motion vs.  
4 Interstate Power and Light Company.

5 May I have the appearances for the  
6 record please starting with the company.

7 MS. MOORE: Appearing on behalf of Interstate  
8 Power and Light Company, Jennifer Moore, 200 First  
9 Street, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 52401. My phone  
10 number is 319-786-4219.

11 MR. BREMEL: Appearing on behalf of Interstate  
12 Power and Light Company, Michael Bremel,  
13 B-r-e-m-e-l, address 4902 North Biltmore,  
14 B-i-l-t-m-o-r-e, Lane, Madison, Wisconsin, 53718;  
15 Phone No. 608-458-5195.

16 MS. JONES: Burma C. Jones appearing on behalf of  
17 the Financial Analysis Division of the Illinois  
18 Commerce Commission, 527 East Capitol Avenue,  
19 Springfield, Illinois, 62701, Phone No.  
20 217-785-5784.

21 MR. MAPLE: Mark Maple appearing on behalf of  
22 the Engineering Department of the Energy Division of

1 the Illinois Commerce Commission, 527 East Capitol  
2 Avenue, Springfield, Illinois, 62701; Phone No.  
3 217-785-3403.

4 JUDGE HAYNES: I understand that three of you,  
5 Mr. Bremel, Ms. Jones, and Mr. Maple, you are  
6 witnesses here today and are going to be providing  
7 testimony; is that correct?

8 MS. JONES: Yes, your Honor.

9 MR. MAPLE: Yes.

10 MR. BREMEL: Yes, your Honor.

11 JUDGE HAYNES: I'm going to go ahead and swear  
12 all three of you in at the same time then. Please  
13 raise your right hand.

14 (Witnesses sworn.)

15 Thank you.

16 Ms. Moore, would you like to begin.

17 MS. MOORE: Yes. I would like to call on behalf  
18 of Interstate Power and Light, Michael Bremel.

19 MICHAEL BREMEL,  
20 called as a witness herein, having been first duly  
21 sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

22

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY

3 MS. MOORE:

4 Q. Mr. Bremel, please state your name for the  
5 record.

6 A. Michael Bremel, B-r-e-m-e-l.

7 Q. And are you the same Michael Bremel, who  
8 previously filed prefiled testimony on April 1,  
9 2004?

10 A. Yes, I am.

11 Q. And that testimony consist of seven pages in  
12 question-and-answer format and three exhibits?

13 A. Yes, it does.

14 Q. And if I were to ask you the same questions  
15 today, would your answers be the same?

16 A. Yes, they would.

17 Q. Do you have any changes or corrections you  
18 would like to make to your testimony or exhibits?

19 A. No, I do not.

20 MS. MOORE: Your Honor, at this time I would like  
21 to submit Mr. Bremel for cross-examination and  
22 tender -- and enter Mr. Bremel for cross-examination

1 and submit his testimony and exhibits into evidence.

2 JUDGE HAYNES: Staff, do you have any

3 cross-examination for the witness?

4 MR. MAPLE: No, we do not.

5 JUDGE HAYNES: Ms. Moore, what are the exact

6 exhibit numbers?

7 MS. MOORE: Yes. I'm sorry. The exhibits have

8 previously been identified as Exhibit 1.1, which

9 consist of eight pages; Exhibit 1.2, which is also

10 eight pages, and Exhibit 1.3, which is two pages.

11 JUDGE HAYNES: So 1.1 is his direct testimony?

12 MS. MOORE: I'm sorry. His direct testimony is

13 Exhibit 1.0.

14 JUDGE HAYNES: Okay. And the attachments to 1.0

15 are --

16 MS. MOORE: Are Exhibit 1.1; Exhibit 1.2, and

17 exhibit attachments 1.3.

18 JUDGE HAYNES: Does he have rebuttal testimony?

19 MS. MOORE: No, we did not submit any.

20 THE WITNESS: Yes, we did.

21 MS. MOORE: We did? I thought we did a letter in

22 lieu of testimony.

1 THE WITNESS: Oh.

2 JUDGE HAYNES: I have not the actual testimony  
3 but the page on e-docket that says Rebuttal  
4 Testimony of Michael Bremel.

5 MS. MOORE: Oh, I'm sorry. My mistake. I got  
6 four dockets going on and in other dockets we didn't  
7 submit anything.

8 JUDGE HAYNES: But I didn't actually pull the  
9 docket up.

10 MS. MOORE: I'm going to do that right now and  
11 have that submitted, because I --

12 JUDGE HAYNES: I just want the record to be clear  
13 that's all.

14 MS. MOORE: And I appreciate that. I apologize  
15 about that.

16 Mike, do you have that testimony before  
17 you?

18 THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm shooting them over to you.

19 (A brief pause.)

20 MS. MOORE: Q. And, Mr. Bremel, did you file  
21 testimony on October 14, 2004 as rebuttal testimony  
22 in this case?



1       A.     Yes, I did.

2       Q.     And if I were to ask you the same questions  
3 in that testimony, would your answers be the same?

4       A.     Yes, they would.

5       MS. MOORE: Your Honor, at this time I would like  
6 to submit the Rebuttal Testimony of Michael Bremel.

7       JUDGE HAYNES: And is that --

8       MS. MOORE: I think we had filed it as Exhibit  
9 2.0 but -- I think it will have Exhibit 1.0 but that  
10 should be reflected as Exhibit 2.0 for  
11 clarification.

12       JUDGE HAYNES: Okay. Staff is there any  
13 objection?

14       MS. JONES: No.

15       JUDGE HAYNES: Okay. So we have, as previously  
16 filed on e-docket, the direct testimony of  
17 Mr. Bremel, which is Exhibit 1.0, and it's  
18 attachments which are labeled as 1.1, 1.2, and  
19 1.3, and then also, as previously filed on e-docket,  
20 the Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Bremel, which is  
21 Exhibit 2.0, and those exhibits will be admitted  
22 into the record.

1 (Whereupon, Interstate  
2 Exhibit Nos. 1.0, 1.1,  
3 1.2, 1.3 & 2.0 were  
4 previously marked for  
5 identification and  
6 received in evidence.)

7 MS. MOORE: Your Honor, just one more  
8 clarification. He did have an attachment, which  
9 would be -- was previously identified as 1.1 but for  
10 clarity sake we marked it as Exhibit 2.1.

11 JUDGE HAYNES: 2.1 to the rebuttal testimony.

12 THE WITNESS: And 2.2.

13 JUDGE HAYNES: And 2.2.

14 MS. MOORE: Thank you.

15 JUDGE HAYNES: Okay. 2.1 and 2.2, the  
16 attachments to the rebuttal testimony, are also  
17 admitted.

18 (Whereupon, Interstate  
19 Exhibit Nos. 2.1 and 2.2  
20 were received in  
21 evidence.)

22 Thank you, Mr. Bremel.

1                   Staff, would you like to proceed.

2       MS. JONES:   Thank you, your Honor.

3                   DIRECT EXAMINATION

4                   BY

5                   MS. JONES:

6                   I am Burma C. Jones, an accountant in  
7 the Accounting Department of the Financial Analysis  
8 Division of the Illinois Commerce Commission.

9                   I prepared a document marked as ICC  
10 Staff Exhibit 1.0, entitled, "Direct Testimony of  
11 Burma C. Jones," consisting of seven pages of text  
12 and one schedule, which was filed on the e-docket  
13 system on October 6, 2004. There are no changes or  
14 corrections to be made to the document as previously  
15 filed.

16                  If I were to be asked the same  
17 questions today, my responses would be the same.  
18 I offer these documents for admission into the  
19 record.

20       JUDGE HAYNES:   Ms. Moore, do you have any  
21 questions for the witness?

22       MS. MOORE:   No, your Honor, I do not.

1 JUDGE HAYNES: Any objection to admitting her  
2 testimony?

3 MS. MOORE: No.

4 JUDGE HAYNES: Okay. Staff Exhibit 1.0 is  
5 admitted.

6 (Whereupon, Staff  
7 Exhibit No. 1.0 was  
8 previously marked for  
9 identification and  
10 received in evidence.)

11 Mr. Maple.

12 MR. MAPLE: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.

13 DIRECT EXAMINATION

14 BY

15 MR. MAPLE:

16 I am Mark Maple and I'm an energy  
17 engineer in the Engineering Department of the Energy  
18 Division of the Illinois Commerce Commission. I am  
19 presenting Staff Exhibit 2.0 entitled, "Direct  
20 Testimony of Mark Maple," which was filed on  
21 e-docket on October 6, 2004. It consists of a cover  
22 page and four pages of written testimony.



1 review that draft order by December 17th, and the  
2 company will have that filed on e-docket by December  
3 20th.

4                   Is there anything else we need to get  
5 on the record today?

6       MS. MOORE: Nothing further from Interstate.

7       MS. JONES: Nothing from staff, your Honor.

8       JUDGE HAYNES: Okay. The record's marked heard  
9 and taken.

10                   HEARD AND TAKEN.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22